

**Remarks**

Claims 13-20 are pending herein. By this Amendment, claims 13-17 have been amended, and new claims 18-20 have been added.

Claims 13-17 have each been amended to delete the phrase “mechanically scrollable” from the preamble of the claim and to add the recitation --further wherein the display is mechanically scrollable-- at the end of the claim.

New claims 18-20 depend upon claims 13-15, respectively, and recite that the display is portable and capable of displaying information in a wide screen. Support for this recitation can be found in the specification at, for example, page 31, line 28 to page 32, line 2.

In the Office Action, claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,285,298 to Kaneko et al. (“Kaneko”); and claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaneko in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,052,137 to Shimada (“Shimada”).

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action.

**I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kaneko. Kaneko is cited for disclosing a claimed display, illustrated in Fig. 11A in the reference, comprising a write unit 53 for writing information to the rewritable display medium 55, the write unit being disposed near an entrance/exit portion of the first winder 52, and an erase unit (59, 60) for erasing information from the display medium, the erase unit being disposed near an entrance/exit portion of the second winder 61 (see col. 13, line 30 – col. 14, line 3). The Examiner does not give patentable weight to the recitation “mechanically scrollable” because it is located in the preamble. According to the Examiner, “[a] preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone.”

As pointed out above, claims 13-15 have been amended to delete the phrase “mechanically scrollable” from the preamble of the claims and to add the recitation --further

wherein the display is mechanically scrollable-- at the end of the claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the recitation --further wherein the display is mechanically scrollable-- in the body of each of claims 13-15 has patentable weight.

As taught in the instant specification, an advantage of the mechanically scrollable display is that when it is rolled up, the display is compact enough to carry around (see, e.g., page 24, lines 8-11, and page 32, lines 14-15). A further advantage is that the display medium wound up around the winder can be unwound into a screen having an appropriate area to display the information recorded thereon, thereby permitting a large amount of information to be displayed at one time, that is, on a large screen (see, e.g., page 32, lines 16-20).

Kaneko does not teach a mechanically scrollable display. Kaneko discloses, e.g., at Figs. 2, 11A and 12A and the corresponding discussions in the specification, that the display portion 17 or 66 is fixed. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicant submits that Kaneko does not anticipate claims 13-15. New claims 18-20 depend upon claims 13-15, respectively, and are patentable over Kaneko for at least the same reason claims 13-15 are patentable over the reference.

## **II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaneko in view of Shimada. According to the Examiner, the only differences between the display taught in Kaneko and the display set forth in the instant claims are the erase unit comprising an electric-field application means and the display medium being formed with PDLC film. Shimada is cited for disclosing that it was known to employ an electric-field application means with PDLC film (see col. 5, line 66 – col. 6, line 40). Thus, according to the Examiner, it would have been obvious in view of Shimada to use an electric-field application means with PDLC film in the display disclosed in Kaneko for displaying information with high reliability and fast erasing time.

Claims 16 and 17 have been amended to delete the phrase “mechanically scrollable” from the preamble of the claims and to add the recitation --further wherein the display is mechanically scrollable-- at the end of the claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the recitation --further wherein the display is mechanically scrollable-- in the body of claims 16 and 17 has patentable weight.

As pointed out above, Kaneko does not disclose a mechanically scrollable display. Thus, even if Kaneko were modified to include an electric-field application means with PDLC film as taught in Shimada, the result would not have rendered amended claims 16 and 17 obvious. Therefore, for at least this reason, claims 16 and 17 would not have been obvious over Kaneko in view of Shimada.


### **III. Conclusion**

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections set forth in the Office Action be withdrawn and that claims 13-20 be allowed.

If any fees under 37 C. F. R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 are due in connection with this filing, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 02-4300, Order No. 033710M531444.

Respectfully submitted,  
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By:

  
Michael A. Makuch, Reg. No. 32,263  
1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Telephone: (202) 263-4300  
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329

Dated: July 19, 2005